

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION**

REBECCA THOMASSON,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	Case SA-21-cv-00687-JKP
	§	
PHILIP D. STERN,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	
	§	

**DECLARATION OF PHILIP D. STERN  
IN RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF’S MOTION [DKT. NO. 27]**

I, Philip D. Stern, declare:

1. I am the Defendant. I am also an attorney at law licensed in the State of New Jersey and the District of Columbia. I am also admitted to the bar of this Court.
2. I make this Declaration in response to Plaintiff’s Motion [Dkt. No. 27] for an extension of time to file Plaintiff’s Reply.
3. In ¶3 of Plaintiff’s Motion, Plaintiff represents, “Defendant consents to Plaintiff’s requested extension.”
4. I was never contacted by anyone soliciting my consent to the requested extension. I have not received any emails from Plaintiff’s counsel, Amy L.B. Ginsburg or Christopher Saldaña, after receiving an email from Mr. Saldaña on January 19, 2022. Nor have I received or placed any telephone call with Ms. Ginsburg or Mr. Saldaña this year—indeed, to the best of my recollection, I have not spoken directly with Ms. Ginsburg in at least six years and Ms. Saldaña in several years.

5. While I have no objection to Plaintiff's request<sup>1</sup>, I do not appreciate having my consent represented to the Court when I never actually gave my consent and my consent was never sought.

*In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.*

Dated: February 1, 2022

\_\_\_\_\_  
s/Philip D. Stern  
Philip D. Stern

## **I. CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Philip D. Stern, hereby certify that, on the date set forth in the header of this document, I electronically filed this document with the Clerk of the Court using CM/ECF and that service was perfected on all counsel of record and interested parties through CM/ECF.

Dated: February 1, 2022

\_\_\_\_\_  
s/Philip D. Stern  
Philip D. Stern

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff's Motion [Dkt. No. 27] refers to my "multiple 'responses'" and "opposition filed out of time" but did not state whether she objects to them based on timeliness. I infer she does not object and, therefore, extend the same courtesy by not objecting to Plaintiff's request.